



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/545,707  | 04/07/2000  | Sundaram Ramakesavan | 42390.P8181         | 1262             |
| 7590  | 04/06/2005  |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| David Kaplan<br>Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP<br>12400 Wilshire Boulevard<br>Seventh Floor<br>Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 |             |                      |                     | NGUYEN, LE V     |
|   |             | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        | 2174             |
| DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005   |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                       |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b>   |  |
|                              | 09/545,707             | RAMAKESAVAN, SUNDARAM |  |
|                              | Examiner<br>Le Nguyen  | Art Unit<br>2174      |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 December 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 18-27 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 11-15 and 18-27 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 5/18/04.
2. Claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8 and 18 are independent claims; claims 1, 8 and 18 are amended; and, claims 24-27 are newly added.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 25-27 are objected to because of the following informalities in claim 25: "a second electronic," needs to be changed to -- a second electronic device, --. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
6. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the multiple electronic devices" in lines 2-3 of page

3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. Claims 1, 4-9, 12-15, 18, 21-25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. ("Wagner") in view of Pennock et al. ("Pennock").

As per claim 1, Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising:

- (a) displaying a first list of names on a display screen of a first electronic device coupled to the wireless network (fig. 3A, "Address Book");
- (b) receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device (col. 6, lines 40-41; *an identification signal such as a telephone number that is unfamiliar to the user of the first device appears in the display screen*; col. 6, lines 24-45; col. 8, lines 22-24 and lines 49-54; *i.e. users may send messages to multiple electronic devices*); and
- (c) providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the default name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book*).

Although Wagner teaches displaying a visual cue on the display screen, in response to receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device

Art Unit: 2174

in the first list of names of electronic devices (col. 6, lines 40-41), Wagner does not explicitly disclose a visual cue displayed on the display screen to single out a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen and responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal, identifying a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device.

Pennock teaches a visual cue displayed on the display screen to single out a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen and responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal, identifying the target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device (figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18; col. 8, lines 30-43; col. 18, lines 57-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Pennock's visual cue displayed on the display screen to single out a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen and responsive to receiving the wireless identification signal, identifying a target name from the first list of names displayed on the display screen as being associated with the second electronic device wherein each name in the first list is associated with an active electronic device to Wagner's display of a visual cue on the display screen, in response to receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, wherein a broadcast of a wireless identification signal being sent to multiple electronic devices, the cue identifying a default name associated with the second electronic device in the first

list of names of electronic devices so that users may view a list of all present participants.

As per claim 4, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to multiple user-selected electronic devices from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic devices to identify themselves using an audio or visual cue (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue "Sue Smith" is displayed*).

As per claim 5, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing a data exchange option on the first electronic device to send a file to the second electronic device, the data exchange option identifying the second electronic device by the local name (Wagner: *see figs. 5, 8 and respective portions of the specification; stock information and stock quotes are sent in batch files over the wireless networking device*).

As per claim 6, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network wherein displaying the first list of names is done in response to a user of the first electronic device selecting a wireless network mapping menu option (Wagner: fig 3A; *selecting an address book*).

Claim 7 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 4 and 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 1(b) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 14 is similar in scope to claim 1(c) and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to claim 8, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 24, the modified Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the target name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a*

*telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book).*

As per claim 25, the modified Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising receiving a broadcast of a wireless identification signal from a second electronic device, the identification signal including a first default name assigned by a user of the second electronic device (Pennock: figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18; *first default name assigned by a user of the second electronic device*).

As per claim 27, the modified Wagner teaches a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising providing an option on the first electronic device to rename the default name associated with the second electronic device to a local name (col. 4, lines 55-58; *user may access various functions of a telephone address book such as inherent functions of editing/renaming an address book*).

8. Claims 2, 3, 11, 19, 20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wagner et al. ("Wagner") in view of Pennock et al. ("Pennock") as applied to claims 1, 8 and 18, and further in view of Smith et al. ("Smith").

As per claim 2, although the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless identification signal from the first electronic device to the multiple electronic devices, including the second electronic device the identification signal including a first default name of the first electronic device being assigned by a user of the first electronic device (Pennock: figs. 6, 8, 9-15 and 18) and in response to the second electronic

device unable to translate the first default name, displaying a visual cue on the display screen of the second device the cue identifying the first electronic device (Wagner: col. 6, lines 57-63; *if the second electronic device is unable to match the first default name to a name in the rolodex, a visual cue on the display screen of the second device identifying the first electronic device is displayed in accordance with conventional caller ID technology, i.e. a number is displayed in place of a name*), the modified Wagner does not explicitly disclose the cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device from a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices (Smith: col. 12, lines 38-48). Smith teaches a visual cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device from a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices (col. 12, lines 38-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's teaching of a visual cue identifying a second default name associated with the first electronic device from a second list of names of a plurality of electronic devices in a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network to the modified Wagner's teaching of a visual cue on the display screen of the second device the cue identifying the first electronic device in a method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network in order to provide a user a way of quickly identifying a signal when only part of the signal's data is known.

As per claim 3, the modified Wagner teaches the method of mapping electronic devices coupled to a wireless network comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to a user-selected electronic device from the first list of names of

electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic device to identify itself using an audio or visual cue (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue “Sue Smith” is displayed*).

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19, which is dependent on claim 18, is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 20, the modified Wagner teaches a computer-readable medium comprising a plurality of instructions readable therefrom, the instructions, when executed by a first electronic device, cause the first electronic device to perform operations comprising an option to broadcast a wireless activation signal to multiple user-selected electronic devices from the first list of names of electronic devices, the activation signal to cause the user-selected electronic devices to identify themselves using an audio or visual cue (Wagner: figs. 3A and 4; *upon receiving a signal from another electronic device, a visual cue “Sue Smith” is displayed*).

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 11-15 and 18-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Inquires***

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4068. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN  
Patent Examiner  
March 29, 2005

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100